

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, 18 and 22 have been amended. Claims 2 and 8 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 15-30 are pending and under consideration.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat et al. (US 2003/138008) (hereinafter "Riazat") in view of Spangler (US 5,547,385) (hereinafter "Spangler").

Claims 2 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler, and further in view of Patrick, Jr. (US 3,767,971) (hereinafter "Patrick, Jr.").

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler, and further in view of Kjarsgaard (US 3,972,356) (hereinafter "Kjarsgaard").

Claims 8 and 18-30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler, Patrick, Jr. and Kjarsgaard.

Riazat discusses high-speed to-can optoelectronic packages. In Riazat, a header 804 may be formed with a ground post 808 for grounding the package. A pair of laser posts 810 and 812 may also extend through the header 804 into the interior region for connection to a laser diode 814. The laser 814 may be mounted vertically onto a silicon submount 816, which would otherwise be mounted ordinarily around the central portion of a header for surface emitting lasers. Riazat, paragraph [0048].

Spangler teaches blind mating guides on a backwards compatible connector. In Spangler, ground contacts extend along insulating alignment posts. Prior to connecting the signal contacts along the mating face of the connector with those of a mating electrical connector on the docking work station, the ground contacts on the alignment posts engage corresponding ground contacts on the mating electrical connector. Thus, the ground contacts of both connectors become engaged electrical connector before the signal contacts become engaged. Spangler, 1:51-1:58.

Further in Spangler, in greater detail, each electrical connector 2 includes insulative

posts 12 and the conductive ground contacts 10 extending along the posts 12. The ground contacts 10, together with the electrical contacts 7, extend through the housing 4 and through the rear face 5. Electrical terminals 13 on the ground contacts 10 project from the rear face 5 of the housing 4 for connection to a circuit board. Spangler, 3:23-3:30 and Figure 2.

Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor 10 featuring a discharge end 17 in the form of a sharp pointed cone to concentrate the static electricity and to simplify the ionization of the surrounding air so that static electricity may be bled from the resistor 10 to the atmosphere. Patrick, Jr., 3:11-3:15 and Figure 1.

Kjarsgaard discusses a lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement for an electronic semiconductor package.

#### **Claims 1-4**

Amended claim 1 recites: "...a ground connector having an end that is acutely shaped compared to an end of the least one active connector..." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 2. In contrast to claim 1, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner discuss a ground connector having an acutely shaped end. Patrick, Jr. is cited to show this technical feature of the present invention. However, as noted in the Office Action, Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor, not a ground connector as recited in claim 1. The static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., when combined with the optoelectronic package of Riazat and the connector of Spangler would create an inoperable reference that teaches away from the combination. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riazat and Spangler is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 2 has been cancelled. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 3 and 4 recite features that patentably distinguish over the cited references, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 4 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **Claims 6-10**

Amended claim 6 recites: "...wherein an end of the protruding portion of the ground connector is acutely shaped compared to an end of the protruding portion of the at least one active connector." Support for this amendment may be found in at least original claim 8. In

contrast to claim 6, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner discuss a ground connector having an acutely shaped protruding portion. Patrick, Jr. is cited to show this technical feature of the present invention. However, as noted in the Office Action, Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor, not a ground connector as recited in claim 6. The static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., when combined with the optoelectronic package of Riazat, the connector of Spangler and the lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement of Kjarsgaard, would create an inoperable reference that teaches away from the combination. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riazat, Spangler and Kjarsgaard is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claim 8 has been cancelled. Claims 7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 7, 9 and 10 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Kjarsgaard and Patrick, Jr., taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 10 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **Claims 15-17**

Claim 15 recites: "...a ground connector longer than the at least one active connector and more acutely shaped than an end of the at least one active connector." In contrast to claim 15, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner discuss a ground connector more acutely shaped than the active connector. Patrick, Jr. is cited to show this technical feature of the present invention. However, as noted in the Office Action, Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor, not a ground connector as recited in claim 6. The static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., when combined with the optoelectronic package of Riazat, and the connector of Spangler, would create an inoperable reference that teaches away from the combination. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riazat and Spangler is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 16 and 17 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Kjarsgaard and Patrick, Jr., taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 17 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

### **Claims 18-21**

Amended claim 18 recites: "...the ground connector is at least longer than the at least one active connector and more acutely shaped than the at least one active connector." Claim 18 has been amended to correct a misspelled word. In contrast to claim 18, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner discuss a ground connector more acutely shaped than the active connector. Patrick, Jr. is cited to show this technical feature of the present invention. However, as noted in the Office Action, Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor, not a ground connector as recited in claim 6. The static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., when combined with the optoelectronic package of Riazat, the connector of Spangler and the lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement of Kjarsgaard, would create an inoperable reference that teaches away from the combination. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riazat, Spangler and Kjarsgaard is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 19-21 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Kjarsgaard and Patrick, Jr., taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 21 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

### **Claims 22-25**

Amended claim 22 recites: "...the ground connector is longer than at least one active connector and more acutely shaped than the at least one active connector." Claim 22 has been amended to correct a misspelled word. In contrast to claim 22, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner discuss a ground connector more acutely shaped than the active connector. Patrick, Jr. is cited to show this technical feature of the present invention. However, as noted in the Office Action, Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor, not a ground connector as recited in claim 6. The static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., when combined with the optoelectronic package of Riazat, the connector of Spangler and the lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement of Kjarsgaard, would create an inoperable reference that teaches away from the combination. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riazat, Spangler and Kjarsgaard is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 23-25 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Kjarsgaard and Patrick, Jr., taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 25 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **Claims 26-30**

Claim 26 recites: "...cutting the end of the ground connector so that the ground connector is more acutely shaped than the active connectors." In contrast to claim 26, none of the references relied upon by the Examiner discuss cutting a ground connector to have an acute shape. Patrick, Jr. is cited to show this technical feature of the present invention. However, as noted in the Office Action, Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor, not a ground connector as recited in claim 26. The static bleed resistor of Patrick, Jr., when combined with the optoelectronic package of Riazat, the connector of Spangler and the lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement of Kjarsgaard, would create an inoperable reference that teaches away from the combination. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Patrick, Jr. with Riazat, Spangler and Kjarsgaard is improper and cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 27-30 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Patrick, Jr. and Kjarsgaard, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 30 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 10, 2006

By: Gregory W. Harper  
Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501